PUBLIC COMMENTS

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

HILTON GARDENS

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

7:00 P.M.

NOVEMBER 20, 2008

A P P E A R A N C E S

HOLMES BROWN, Facilitator

RAY V. FURSTENAU, Deputy Manager for Nuclear Energy
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Idaho Operations Office
1955 Fremont Avenue, MS-1203
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415

November 20, 2008 7:00 p.m.

(The following public comments were made.)

FACILITATOR BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this public meeting on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. The development of an environmental impact statement for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

My name is Holmes Brown and I will serve as the facilitator for this evening's meeting. My role is to ensure that this meeting runs on schedule and that everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy nor an advocate for any party or position. I trust you-all have had an opportunity to attend the open house in the preceding hour.

Also at the registration table, you should have received a participant's packet. If not, please raise your hand so the staff can bring one to you. It contains important information on the presentation and is a convenient place to take notes during the

briefing that will follow in a few minutes.

Anyone else? We've got -- I see three or four back there. Thanks.

There are three purposes for tonight's meeting. First to provide information on the content of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, or PEIS, and on the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, which governs the process.

Second, to answer your questions on the Draft PEIS and NEPA, and third to receive and record your formal comments on the Draft PEIS. The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these purposes.

We will begin with a presentation by Ray Furstenau, who is the deputy manager for nuclear energy for DOE's Idaho Operation's Office. To answer your questions, project staff will be available throughout the evening at the display tables in the lobby. They can discuss the Draft PEIS and NEPA process, the contents of printed materials on display, and the contents of Mr. Furstenau's slide show.

Following Mr. Furstenau's presentation, we will recess so that we can set up to receive

your comments and that you may pursue further questions with available project staff.

Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be available to receive your comments and suggestions regarding the GNEP Draft PEIS. All of your comments will be transcribed and will be part of the permanent record.

I'm now pleased to introduce Mr. Ray Furstenau, who's DOE Idaho's Deputy Manager for Nuclear Energy. He will discuss the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the Draft PEIS.

(Mr. Furstenau's presentation was given.)

FACILITATOR BROWN: It's now time to receive your formal comments on the Draft PEIS. This is your opportunity to let DOE know your response to the draft and other suggestions and additions you have. The court reporter will transcribe your statement. Our reporter tonight is Lani Lewis.

Let me review a few grounds for formal comments. Please step up to the microphone over there. When your name is called, introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written version

of your comments, please provide a copy to the court reporter when you've completed your statement. Also please give the court reporter any other documents that you would like to see included in the record. They will be labeled and submitted.

I will call two names at a time. The first is the person to speak and the second is the person to follow. In view of the number of people who've indicated an interest in speaking this evening, please confine your remarks to four minutes. A staff person in the front row will hold up a sign letting you know that you have a minute remaining. So at that point if you can conclude your remarks.

Mr. Furstenau will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy during the formal comment period. He will not be responding to any questions or comments during this session.

So with that by way of introduction, let me call our first speaker and the person to follow. Willie Preacher will begin our comments, and Leslie Huddleston will follow Willie.

WILLIE PREACHER: Hello. My name is

Willie Preacher and I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes in Fort Hall which is -- INL is located on original treaty right areas of our Tribe.

The concern I think the Tribes have is a lot of the issues with the GNEP process as a technology -- has the technology been proven, and the generation of waste; the types of waste that's going to be generated. As of right now Yucca Mountain has not opened. Yucca Mountain may not open. And the question always remains, you know, why are we starting to create new waste? We haven't even found a place for the old waste to go. That is a concern.

Also the concern on transportation of spent fuel if it goes across the reservation, whether it's going to go to Yucca Mountain, and the GNEP technology has been proven, will the waste come back out of Yucca Mountain and go back to being reprocessed again? So those are the questions.

The other question I think the Tribe has is what's going to come first; GNEP or Yucca Mountain? And the proven technology I think is the biggest concern that the Tribes have; what

type of waste are you going to generate; where are you going to put the waste; and how soon is this process going to run? It's been a number of years for Yucca Mountain to open. How many years is it going to be for GNEP to even get itself off the ground?

So those are the questions I think the Tribes have. And this is the safety of the members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on the transportation road to and from the INL.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Leslie Huddleston and she will be followed by Russ Mathews.

LESLIE HUDDLESTON: My name is Leslie Huddleston and I am here representing U.S. Senator Mike Crapo. I do have a statement that he'd like to me to read.

While we continue to make great strides in new, clean nuclear energy production, we have failed to maintain adequate funding for the research development and demonstration of spent nuclear fuel management technologies.

The federal government is responsible for the management of domestic spent nuclear fuel

and it's essential that we live up to commitment to address the existing and future needs through programs like Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

The importance of nuclear energy to Idaho, our nation, and our world cannot be understated. We have come a long way from a historic nuclear powering of Atomic City in the 1950s, the potential we have created must be explored with the full support and input of critical public private partnerships.

Proliferation, resistant technologies are the key to effective, secure, and reasonable -- excuse me -- responsible reprocessing of spent fuel and the reduction of waste.

Utilizing the full potential of nuclear energy and reducing waste is a responsible policy to pursue. It is also in the broader security interests of our nation to reach up to other nation-states who want to deal with nuclear energy in a responsible, modern fashion meeting the energy needs of their own citizens. We reach out as GNEP suggests and gain influence and working relationships that will help mitigate future conflicts.

GNEP and the safe management and reuse of spent nuclear fuel is critical to the future of the commercial industry -- excuse me -- the commercial nuclear industry and will help secure our future energy supplies. Continuing to pursue GNEP is a decision clearly in the best interest of our nation.

Sincerely, Mike Crapo, U.S. Senate, Idaho.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Russ Mathews is next and Eric Simpson will follow.

RUSS MATHEWS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am Russ Mathews. I'm a member of the Idaho House of Representatives State Legislature. I serve on the Environment Energy and Technology Committee in that legislature.

I would like to stand and, again, reaffirm my support of GNEP and the -- and the draft of the PEIS statement and that we should should move forward with it with -- with these -- with these parts that I would like to emphasize. I am in support of a closed fuel cycle alternative. It will go a long ways to address waste issues. It will go a long ways in

addressing -- making sure the fuels do that exist assist us in getting a better value and a better ultimate product in minimizing existing waste.

Recycling is -- in my book is definitely the way to go, and it's a way of taking care of the waste we already have. In general, in support of the GNEP, utilization of our research and development facility here in this area will go a long ways in the ultimate obtainment of our energy goals as a state and as a nation and as an environment in international community.

It will -- in support of this GNEP process and in the draft, will go a long ways in reducing U.S. dependence on -- on traditional fuels. Next it will go a long ways towards giving us safe and clean energy and provide for a cleaner atmosphere.

And, finally, most importantly of all, moving forward with the GNEP and with the -- this draft in the next step of the process it will go a long ways to minimize proliferation risks by radical regimes and organizations. And it will go a long ways in finally in addressing those areas so this energy -- abundant energy can be

developed and maintained safely.

I'd like to commend everybody who has come tonight and who will be participating in the process, and welcome you here and, again, extend my support of the GNEP process and the draft that we're having under consideration tonight.

Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Erik Simpson to be followed by Jared Fuhriman.

ERIK SIMPSON: Good evening. I'm Erik Simpson, State Representative for District 32.

Environmental activists have preached the importance of conservation and recycling to preserve our country's resources, and I couldn't agree more. Let's recycle the country's spent nuclear fuel and let's preserve the valuable resource called enriched uranium.

Spent fuel is a resource, it's not a waste form. It can be recycled and recovered safely and it should be. The INL has a building created to reprocess spent nuclear fuel. This building has never been used. It's merely awaiting utilities and other equipment to become functional.

Let's close the fuel cycle and open up

the country's energy future with nuclear power.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Our next speaker after Jared will be Kathryn Kain.

Welcome. This is -- we're happy to be in your wonderful town.

JARED FUHRIMAN: Well, thank you very much. We're glad to have you.

We do have property here for sale, if you want to --

FACILITATOR BROWN: I'll turn in my return airline ticket.

JARED FUHRIMAN: We'll hold you to it.

I'm thankful to be here tonight. I come before you wearing two hats. The first hat is that of the mayor of the City of Idaho Falls. We have approximately 57,000 people here in Idaho Falls and we've -- due to the -- some great foresight to our forefathers, we have had electricity provided through hydro-electric turbine plants. And for many, many years we've been able to provide a majority of our power through hydro-electric.

When I came into office and was working

with the city, we were able to provide close to about 48 percent of the electricity ourselves here in our city. But that has decreased now to almost 30 percent. And, frankly, we're a little concerned as a city.

We -- we're trying to diversify our portfolio. Recently we are looking at a coal-fire generating plant in Delta, Utah. It's fossil fuel. And, frankly, we're not real excited, per se, about that. But by the same token, we have a responsibility to figure out how we're going to be able to provide electricity and power to our -- our citizens.

We've looked at some of the other renewables, and we've -- there's a lot potential out there, but the problem that we're finding is that we can't have sustainable renewable energy. That's extremely important for us that we can have that on demand.

And at the same time, we're in the process of trying to put together a 20-year contract with the BPA, and let me tell you, folks, we're talking millions and millions and millions of dollars to try to secure enough energy for us. And it's -- we're trying to

juggle -- trying to take away the burden from our taxpayers.

And that brings me to nuclear energy. I support this proposal. It was about 18, 19 months ago that myself and 17 other mayors up and down our region stood before us in the GNEP scoping hearing all in support of the GNEP proposal. We had 25 mayors actually sign a letter that was read at that time in support of that.

I support the GNEP proposal because I support nuclear and the reason why I support that is because the confidence and the history that we have in our own backyard with INL and the great work that they have done there. They have brought a great sense of security and confidence in their work and their efforts. And, frankly, we've -- they've gained our trust. We've been very fortunate to have shipped more waste out than this state has ever seen. And so that's a proven fact.

The other hat that I'm wearing right now is as a father of a lot of kids. And kids that are in college and kids that are going to be moving out of the house and my future

grandchildren. And, frankly, I'm concerned how we're going to be able to have enough energy in the future to be able to help sustain them. We know it's a given fact that the renewables are a great source for us. But, frankly, there is not enough to meet the demands.

And that's why I support nuclear energy. It's proven. The rest of the world has seen that. And, frankly, we've fallen way behind in the market in enhancing nuclear technology.

And so I don't care if this GNEP proposal is built in our backyard. I care that it's built, period, and we continue to have that technology. Because we're going to be in some serious trouble if we don't start looking for our future needs.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Kathryn Kain, and she will be followed by Kathryn McCarthy.

KATHRYN KAIN: My name is Kathryn Kain. I am a private citizen. I'm not an expert, orator, or an engineer. I'm here tonight not because of my deep love of public speaking. Trust me. I am here because I want to represent

the quiet majority. A majority that probably is not heard from enough.

That majority lives in eastern Idaho and works here. They raise families and go about their daily lives sharing one common factor: They support nuclear power and research. They know nuclear power is safe and they know it is the power of the future. They know nuclear is the best and only answer.

I am proud to be a part of that majority. Please know that they wholly support Department of Energy's nuclear mission and the closed nuclear fuel cycle.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Kathryn McCarthy and John Grossenbacher will be next.

KATHRYN McCARTHY: My name is Kathy McCarthy. I grew up in Arizona and California, but I have been living in Idaho Falls for over 17 years. I was really young when I moved here.

I am a deputy associate lab director for nuclear science and technology at the Idaho National Laboratory and I'm an affiliate faculty member with Idaho State University. I want to give you a little bit of information about my background.

I have a bachelor of science degree in nuclear engineering from the University of Arizona. And a masters and Ph.D. in nuclear engineering year from the University of California, Los Angeles; more education in order to avoid actually getting a job.

I was a guest scientist at the Kernforschungszentrum, the Nuclear Research Center, in Karlsruhe, Germany, and spent a year in the Soviet Union with the US/USSR Young Scientist Program. It was right before the breakup of the Soviet Union. I am also active in the American Nuclear Society.

But tonight I'm speaking as a private citizen relying on my background and experience in the nuclear field and a desire to provide a secure and environmentally safe energy future for my children. My husband and I have two children. Sean, age 15, and Daniel, age 17, and we believe that the safe, secure, and sustainable expansion of nuclear energy, both domestically and internationally, is absolutely essential to their future.

I majored in nuclear engineering from the very first day of school as an undergraduate

because I believe that it's an important part of our nation's energy security future. I believe it's important that we continue to develop and implement methods to advance the nuclear fuel cycle.

My family and I are strong believers in recycling in general. We need to reduce, reuse, and recycle whenever possible. And we need to think about future generations as we use today's resources and use those resources wisely. Recycling used nuclear fuel is the right thing to do. And I encourage the U.S. to do so.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. John Grossenbacher and Steve Piet will be next.

JOHN GROSSENBACHER: Good evening. I'm John Grossenbacher. I live in Idaho Falls and I'm the director of the Idaho National Laboratory. My short history, I spent about 33 years in the Navy as a nuclear submariner, so I spent a lot of time sleeping with and around and crawling around nuclear reactors.

I came to this place and to this job for the purpose of advancing the use of nuclear energy technology because of its importance to the future of mankind.

My comments on the content of the Draft Programmatic Environment Impact Statement I think the content is appropriate. And I also think it's appropriately inclusive of all the alternatives and when I look at the Department of Energy's considerations in terms of future decision making, their mission, their statutory mission to develop, demonstrate, and promote technology makes sense to me, that it be consistent with our country's objectives makes sense to me.

That it be technically feasible, and that cost is a consideration I think are important disciplines that are absolutely essentially and will help ensure that good choices are made.

Just some -- my perspective, some context on GNEP and energy technologies in general. Technology is a manmade creation; science is not. We discover science; we build technology, so I'd like to think I can be an agnostic about technology. I don't demonize them or romanticize them, I just try to understand them.

And I think our energy choices need to

be thought of in terms of decades and even centuries. And we need to think about how we use energy. Sometimes we think -- I think we categorize our use as wasteful and sometimes it can be, but it's also extraordinarily useful.

When we think of the benefits of medicine, labor saving devices, we like an energy-dense existence, and I think everyone in the world does and I don't see that changing.

The other factor in context is all concentrated and large scale forms of energy generation have costs, risks, and environmental impacts. I don't care what it is. If there's one that doesn't, I don't know what it is. And so I think it's important to consider those things and do relative comparisons.

Nuclear energy in that context is a carbon-free base load source of electrical power and there's important value in that. It certainly is affected today generating 20 percent of U.S. electricity. It's a proven technology. We've been using it for quite some time now and by any measure of relative, large scale, industrial safety standards, it is extraordinarily safe. We've killed more people

refining sugar in this country this year than we did in using nuclear reactors for almost a half century.

So GNEP will be important. It will help us address some near term issues, the burdens of used fuel, which are not trivial. What are we going to do with it? What part of it do we call waste? Do we want to reuse some of it in the future? Those are important questions. And GNEP will help us answer those.

Certainly in the near term, those risks are manageable. But let's think in terms of hundreds of years. It will also address the issue, the near term issue of proliferation risk, which is a challenging issue for of all mankind, but, frankly, in my opinion, is more tied to the will and the desire to have weapons for security than it is a direct association with nuclear energy. So GNEP will help us understand that.

And the final issue for the -- for the longer term is it will help us in terms of the utilization of the resource; the uranium that we dug out of the ground and how much of the energy content we really can get out of it.

So, again, I think GNEP creates the

opportunity for us to understand these things, and to collectively make informed decisions about the future of this technology. And last, but not least, I think it's important because we have to look beyond our own borders, beyond just the interest of the United States, and recognize that the rest of the world is very interested in this technology. It uses it extensively today.

And I think the U.S. has to carefully consider its leadership role and how this technology is employed in the future because it will affect us and other nations, as best I can tell, are going to choose to use nuclear energy to a large extent whether we do or not. And I think, again, what GNEP will do is it will make us much smarter, better informed in some of these long-term choices.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: An audience member has kindly corrected my pronunciation before Steve does.

Our next speaker is Steve Piet. Am I right?

STEVE PIET: Very good.

FACILITATOR BROWN: After Steve, Janice

McGeachin will speak. Steve.

STEVE PIET: Okay. You've just graduated from telemarketer to friend.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay.

STEVE PIET: When I've got -- you know, with an unusual name at home, when I pick up the phone and the last name is mangled, it's not a relative. It's not a friend. It's got to be a telemarketer. So you've -- you've progressed quite a bit.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Well, that's a promotion. Thank you.

STEVE PIET: Yes. From here -- and now you're up there.

I'm a local. So my fellow Idahoans, I'm here as a private citizen. I met my wife here 25 years ago. Across the river where there used to be a hospital is where we had our kids.

At home we recycle newspapers, other papers, aluminum cans, tin cans, plastic, everything we can. When I get a chance, I recycle my blood by donating. In fact, that's how I met my wife. So I really do believe in recycling.

So I support the idea of recycling used

fuel. And I have four points to make. The first, recycling will happen. It must happen. Now whether it happens in ten years or 50 years that I don't know. But it will happen. Every year we recycle more things in this country than we did the year before. And if I don't recycle at home, my kids fuss at me. And I got tired of that.

So the way of the future is we will recycle. We'll conserve those resources. 95 percent of the fuel that comes out of a reactor is still useful stuff. And it's just plain stupid to put it in the ground.

The second point, we ought to start off using the nuclear power plants to recycle that material to the degree we can and not wait for some new, fancy reactors. And those reactors will come along somewhere. But we didn't have to wait for the fanciest jet aircraft to start flying people around the country. So we start using the reactors we got today, nuclear power plants we got today, start off recycling with those.

The third point, think about what happens when we recycle everything we can. As

some of these documents show, if you don't recycle, if you just put all the stuff in the ground, it's stays nasty for a quarter of a million years.

Now, I'm an engineer. I don't have a clue how the hell I'm going to design something that's going to have confidence for a quarter of a million years. That's why Yucca Mountain hasn't opened up yet. But if we recycle and we do it right, we recycle everything we can, we change that to less than 1,000 years. Now, that's a long time for those of us sitting here in Idaho.

But in my travels on vacation, I've been in buildings that are older than that. I was in a Roman coliseum in Verona, Italy that's still is use. It's still in use. And it's way more than 1,000 years old. Well, if they can do it, why the hell can't we? Okay. Now, I'm Italian, therefore I have, you know, Roman blood in me somewhere and so, you know, we can do this.

So the fourth point is I'm confident we can do this. We can do it right not because of a bunch of government folks but because there's a lot of Idahoans working on it. I'm one of them.

There's others in this room. We care about this place. We love this place. I want to stay in Idaho the rest of my life. I wouldn't be up here supporting this if I thought that any of this was a danger to Idaho.

So let's move forward. We do it cautiously. There's a lot of details, but let's get on with the job.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

STEVE PIET: And, again, thanks for getting the name right.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Sure. Well, I understand that I have mangled the next name. I think I'll just stick with first names. Representative, welcome.

JANICE McGEACHIN: Thank you. Hi, my name is Janice McGeachin. I'm state representative for District 32, Idaho Falls, Bonneville County. And a year ago -- last year in March of 2007, I had the honor of driving from -- to Idaho Falls from Boise to read a resolution that the legislature had written up and drafted in full support of the GNEP proposal that we discussed last year. And this resolution

passed through the legislature with solid support, and I'm here to stand before you today in that same support for this plan.

As stated in the legislative proclamation last year, eastern Idaho communities are proud of the Idaho National Laboratory, the birthplace of peaceful applications of atomic energy. The INL has been a good neighbor for over 50 years conducting research to support national defense and energy security.

I appreciate what INL has brought to our region, an educated workforce, good schools, well paying jobs, and a chance to participate in important work that helps build a solid future for our country and our children.

Our citizens are also knowledgeable when it comes to nuclear energy. We recognize that it is an inexhaustible energy source that supports sustainable development.

We understand that concerns of nuclear waste management and the potential for nuclear proliferation have slowed growth of nuclear power in the U.S. and we feel closing the fuel cycle will address these concerns.

And above all, we have confidence in

the ability of our neighbors, the scientists and the engineers at the INL, to find solutions to these problems and help the world move to a more secure energy future. So not only am I in full support of this proposal, the concept of having a closed fuel cycle, but I also believe that this is the place for that to be.

At the INL just the other day, we -- I attended a meeting where they talked to us about how the INL is the best place to develop an energy island, and that we can -- we can take all of the renewable energy resources that we have in Idaho and in the whole region around us, this is the best place to do that.

And the other thing that we have going for us over here in Idaho Falls is a facility that's called the Center for Advanced Energy Science, the CAES facility, and this is a great partnership between the State of Idaho, the INL, and all three of our universities; the University of Idaho, BSU, and ISU, and we're all working together to address the energy crisis and there's so much opportunity and so much potential for this type of work to happen in this community.

And that's why I'm here in full support

and as you can see there's a full room of people that support this here, as well.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I'll give you my written testimony.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Brent Dixon is next, and he will be followed by Kemal Pasamehmetoglu.

BRENT DIXON: I'm glad I have an easier name.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Yes.

BRENT DIXON: My name is Brent Dixon. I was born and I grew up in eastern Oregon, so no, I'm not a native of Idaho, but eastern Oregon looks an awful like Idaho. I've been here for 28 years now so I certainly feel it's home. I met my wife. I raised my children here.

There's a lot of people in the United States who are against nuclear power. And I think that primarily it's because they don't understand it. And those who live near nuclear reactors all -- the surveys show that they're much more in favor of it than those who live far away from nuclear power.

About a month ago, there was an article

in USA Today on their editorial page. USA Today was in favor of nuclear power. If you're familiar with the paper, they'll have somebody else that's the opposite view. The person with the opposite view stated that if there was an accident thousands of people would die in the first week and tens of thousands later.

Well, we all know that that just isn't true. You know, any of the problems that we've had with nuclear power in the United States, nobody has died from it. So we need to look passed the fear mongering and look to people who say yes instead of people who say no.

One of the things that I was able to do when I was on the County Planning and Zoning Commission is I said yes and voted in favor of the permit that allowed the wind farm that's up on the hill behind us. Well, as the mayor stated earlier, the amount of hydro that we have in town is only a portion of the electricity needs of just our one city.

All of those wind mills up on the hill only produce a small portion of the amount of energy that our one city uses. If instead they had been proposing a nuclear plant tucked behind

the hill where wouldn't even see it, a nuclear plant that would have supplied enough electricity for most of the state, then I certainly would have voted in favor of that as well.

Our president-elect stated this week that he is in favor of more wind, more solar, more biofuels, clean coal, and also nuclear power as solutions to climate change. And so I am with him in favor of more nuclear power.

Getting to some of the specifics about the PEIS, I'm also in favor of recycling our nuclear fuel. As another speaker already mentioned, we recycle our aluminum cans. We recycle our newspaper. Why can't we recycle our nuclear fuel?

One of the things that it will do for us is it will reduce the long-term environmental burden by 99-plus percent. Another thing that it will do is it will allow us to take that same fuel, the same ore that we've mined out of the ground, and get 50 to 100 times as much electricity out of it. And that just makes sense.

I'm also in favor of moving forward with fast reactors that recycle that fuel. I had

the opportunity a month ago to be in Japan and have a tour of a test fast reactor that the Japanese have there; very similar to the one that we had out here on the site about 15 years ago.

Well, what they've done in the meantime is they've moved up to the next scale of fast reactor. What we did is we dismantled ours because we were told to by politicians who were being driven by those who fear what they don't understand.

They are now designing a full-scale plant that would be as large as any of the reactors that we have in the U.S. And we need to get back into that game and move forward and also develop those fast reactors and that will provide for a long-term, clean, and sustainable energy future for us.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Our next speaker is Kemal Pasamehmetoglu who will be followed by Donna Benfield.

KEMAL PASAMEHMETOGLU: Well, the name gets better each time, so -- well, with a name like that and my accent, I'm not going to claim I'm native, but I moved to Idaho Falls about four

years ago and primarily to work on nuclear energy technologies and recycling technologies.

I -- before that I worked at Los Alamos National Laboratory for 19 years. My family and I lived there for 19 years, so for the last 24 years or so I've been living at armed nuclear facilities and never felt unsafe and I wouldn't live in those places if I felt unsafe or if I felt that there was some safety concerns for my family.

So I believe nuclear energy and the later technologies are safe and I was intrigued by the nuclear energy and its promise. When I was teenager, I was educated as a nuclear engineer. I worked as a nuclear engineer and I generally believe that nuclear energy is a gift to humanity, and we have to take advantage of it.

And if it comes to recycling, the first time I was even aware we could recycle nuclear materials was about 30 years ago. I was in a conference as an undergraduate student in Europe, and I was talking to some friend scientists. And they told me that the way United States uses nuclear energy is like eating a banana; except you eat the peel and throw away the banana. So I

started thinking about it since then and I believe that is the -- we got to start eating the banana soon.

I believe that recycling will be soon. And I don't necessarily promote the way the French are doing things today. I think there are better technologies today. We are ready to demonstrate better technologies, and -- but I believe it's just a matter of time before we start recycling these materials.

It may be five years, ten years, thirty years, but it's going to happen and I believe we are ready. We have the technologies for it. We can demonstrate it. We can show that it is the right way to go and it's going to happen soon.

Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Okay. Donna Benfield and she will be followed by Maureen Finnerty.

DONNA BENFIELD: My name is Donna Benfield and I'm the executive director of the Rexburg Area Chamber of Commerce.

The Rexburg Idaho Chamber of Commerce supports nuclear energy and it supports the Idaho National Laboratory as the lead lab for nuclear

energy research in the United States. We call on the new administration and the U.S. Department of Energy to move forward in an aggressive manner with nuclear energy research.

In regards to the Draft PEIS, the Chamber feels that nuclear waste is a problem that won't go away and has to be addressed. We need leadership from DOE and our elected officials. Reprocessing is key -- is a key to revitalizing nuclear energy in the U.S.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Maureen Finnerty. She will be followed by Marty Huebner.

MAUREEN FINNERTY: Thank you. My name is Maureen Finnerty. I am several things. I'm a mother and a grandmother. I am new wife for the first time, and I know that sounds a little backwards, but wait until you hear the rest of my story. I'm also -- I work at the INL as an environmental engineer.

But two other important things about me that have helped form my opinion tonight are I'm a very concerned person about the environment. I'm on the board of the Idaho Environmental Forum and the largest environmental conservation group

in Idaho, which is the Idaho Conservation League.

However, I stand before you tonight not as a representative of either of one those groups but as a concerned citizen, as a very concerned citizen in support of the Global Nuclear Energy Program. I do that -- and I'm not going to speak to you tonight from a technical point of view, but as a citizen again.

I support the Global Nuclear Energy Program because I know that it will ensure that nuclear power will expand in our country, but more importantly on a global basis in a safe and peaceful manner. And that it will address two very impactful global concerns. No. 1, proliferation, and No. 2 is use with waste.

I believe strongly that not only can the GNEP program do this, but it must be done. It must be done not only as the only solution to the world's energy dilemma, but as one of many of necessary options. And I believe nuclear power can supply safe, clean, and sustainable energy.

So why do I have this opinion and how do I know this? Well, it's based on a variety of experiences. It's based on my many years as a youth spent in California.

THE REPORTER: A youth what? A youth?

MAUREEN FINNERTY: A youth.

THE REPORTER: Okay.

MAUREEN FINNERTY: A youth -- not a ute, (phonetic) whatever that is. Although, I was an ant eater at the University of California Irvine, which -- I don't know if any of you are from there, but when I was at the University -- the University of California in Newport Beach and Irvine, I was an extreme antinuclear activist.

And I've also come to form my opinion about nuclear power based on my extreme distress at having to move to Idaho Falls and live in close proximity to a nuclear reactor. My opinion is also formed as my many years spent backpacking with my friends that worked at the INL and asking them questions about what is this nuclear power?

It was also based on my years now spent at the INL as an environmental engineer, and it was spent on my struggle to understand nuclear power and my years -- my two years spent struggling it in a course called implied nuclear engineering. And it's also based on my commitment in state-wide involvement in environmental organizations and other boards.

So I want you to know that I have not reached my opinion in support of nuclear power and this program lightly, or because it was fashionable in college, or because they had the best parties, or based on unfounded fears. It is reached because I believe it is the truth. And as I always stated to those who disagree with me, we all own a piece of the truth.

And I encourage all of you today here, regardless of your point of view, to carefully listen to the truth that others speak and engage in cordial dialogue and listen to what this program has to offer and listen to how we can focus to find solutions to our energy dilemmas and climate change.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

MAUREEN FINNERTY: I won't be submitting these.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Marty Huebner and Arjun Makhijani will be next.

MARTY HUEBNER: I'm Marty Huebner. I'm a 44-year resident of Idaho Falls. I moved here deliberately because I was working in the nuclear industry for the naval reactor program. And my

presentation will be brief. Some of you will be skeptical who know me, but Mr. Piet is one of them there.

But anyway, my presentation will have three parts. I'll talk a little bit about background. What my recommendations are and then a caveat. My background is a BS in applied science, physics, math, and chemistry major, and graduate work in nuclear science and chemical engineering and nuclear engineering at the University of Cincinnati.

I came here. I worked in a uranium refinery in Fernald, Ohio, which is now virtually shut down. And I worked for Nosatomic (phonetic) Bio Laboratory in the naval reactors program. I qualified back to back in two new naval reactors, which I found harder than graduate school. Hear that admiral, but, anyway.

And then I worked at Argonne as a manager of fossil facilities for a number of years with one peripheral involved in reactor technology except I did have a facility in my building that I managed, which was a neutron, a small reactor neutron with radiography.

Now I have a weak recommendation and a

strong recommendation. I haven't had a chance to review all the technologies that are being presented out in the -- out in the hall, but I am familiar with the PWR technology. And I am somewhat familiar with the fast reactor technology that Argonne developed.

And I -- from a scientific standpoint, I'd like more research on the thorium recycle and make it so that it's recyclable. The advantage to that is you don't -- you don't wind up with plutonium. You don't have to worry about proliferation concerns. But that probably won't happen. So what's my real recommendation? The real recommendation is the fast and thermal recyclable technology.

What's its advantage? Well, it's a proven technology. Argonne -- I was on -- involved in the test program with two naval reactors, but that program was duck soup compared to the reactor program -- the test program that Argonne put on.

We took the toughest test I can envision as a nuclear engineer, took the reactor 100 percent power, after taking away the automatic control functions and safety functions,

shut their steam stops at 100 percent power and allow the natural heat of the reactor, and so forth, to do neutron business to shut it down. You can't get safer than that. And that was witnessed by international audience of -- from a bunch of different countries.

So not only is it safe, but you can take, you can bring in the light-water fuel, blend it off -- I don't know the technology, per se -- and use it up. And also I think with the proper -- proper research, you can take this huge amount of depleted uranium, which is now just considered waste, and I think you can feed that back into this cycle. Then you would have a limitless power source. You probably -- there's -- there's been estimated as more energy in the depleted uranium that you can utilize it, then there is in all the oil in Saudi Arabia.

Now, nuclear react -- I'm a hard core environmentalist. I'm a hard core environmentalist first and nuclear engineer second. And people say, who are not executive pro-nuclear, how can you be for nuclear when you're an environmentalist? I said because I believe in facts, not rhetoric, not propaganda.

And here's my caveat. You're going to hear from people or see statements by people who are -- who are not pro-nuclear. I've been to some of the pro-nuclear meetings -- of anti-nuclear meetings of organizations here in Idaho and here's how it was explained to me by the director of one of them.

I said, well, what do you use for your operating philosophy? He says, well, he said, we have no scientists or engineers on our staff, so we don't use a scientific method. And I go, you know, I guess -- you know, that's my life.

He says, we use the precautionary theory. I said, excuse me. He says, yeah, we -- we don't have any of these technologies so we say what will happen if. And then we -- he didn't use this, and I'm paraphrasing what he said, but we think of some -- some happenstance that's not very likely and say, well, you ought to look at this too.

So we have wasted -- by listening to those people, we have wasted years and millions, probably billions, fussing around with this trying to respond to these people who don't use the scientific method, but use precautionary

principle. To me, that's a bunch of organic fertilizer.

But my -- my --

FACILITATOR BROWN: You're over -- you're actually over the limit.

MARTY HUEBNER: Am I?

FACILITATOR BROWN: You didn't see the sign, did you? One minute left.

MARTY HUEBNER: No. Okay. Well, I'll -- I'll finish up.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay.

MARTY HUEBNER: Anyway, I went ahead to the anti-nuke people, they have managed to inhibit nuclear technology for decades, probably accelerated global warming and they have the best propaganda machines since the people in -- on the other side of World War II.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Our next speaker is Arjun Makhijani who will be followed by Terry Todd.

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: My name is Arjun Makhijani. I'm president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. I have a bachelor's in electrical engineering and a

doctorate in nuclear fusion from U.S. Berkeley.

I've looked at this Draft and Environmental Impact Statement. I'll be submitting comments. I just want to give you a few comments to help improve the document.

The Draft is seriously incomplete. I kind of punted on a couple of critical things. I'm not going to enable you to evaluate the environmental impact of this. You've punted the non-proliferation impacts to the NFSA, but they do interact with the environmental impacts.

For instance, if for non-proliferation reasons you're going to locate certain facilities in certain places, they're going to have particular impacts shipping all of the spent fuel to a few countries in the world. This is going to have specific impacts.

I realize that you haven't developed the global part of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership seriously in this, but we all thought that we were going to -- we're dealing with a Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. And really the global piece is missing, so I fail to see the rationale for this Environmental Impact Statement at all. It's become really a cover for

development of a domestic nuclear energy program.

If that's what it is then we should start over with the development of a domestic nuclear energy program or domestic energy program and properly consider the alternative because right now we're neither considering the domestic energy alternative properly nor are we developing the global program because there's essentially no -- no substance on the global program in this -- in this document and you admitted that. There are a few things in here, but it's not substantive.

So in those two regards, the non-proliferation piece of it, which is connected to the environmental piece of it -- for -- for -- I'll just give you a specific example. The French reprocess their spent fuel and they discharge liquid radioactive wastes into the English Channel to the tune of about 100 million gallons a year.

And they've polluted the oceans all the way to Arctic, and, you know, the governments are protesting; Sweden, Germany, Denmark, and so on. So it matters where you put these facilities and what specific facilities you're going to use for

this recycling.

A comment on the word recycling. It's all -- it's been used quite a lot here. But this program doesn't seem to meet the beat about recycling because you're not considering breeder reactors. You're really going to use only a tiny fraction of the Uranium-238 in any of these programs, and so more than 90 percent of the spent fuel by a rough calculation maybe at least -- around 90 percent of the spent fuel will have to be disposed off in some way with a disposal of contaminated recovered U-238 and it's environmental impact is not seriously considered.

By our calculation, the disposal of pure uranium, once it is separated because of the pure uranium, in shallow landfills will produce impacts that are 100s or 1000s of times more than the allowable radiological limits under current regulations, but those impacts are no where to be found. So this is a seriously incomplete document.

The other thing that -- that I think you need to consider in the development of fast reactors is a little bit of the history. The fact that there is essentially no demonstration

of a learning curve in fast reactors, especially sodium cooled fast reactors, is a historical fact.

So EBR-1, which was built here, had a problem. It had to be shut down. It didn't work too well for a long period of time. EBR-2 worked reasonably well. FERMI-1 was built on a model of EBR-2, and it had a partial meltdown very fast and so it didn't work well at all. Fast Flux Test Facility worked reasonably well. Phenix was built in France and it worked reasonably well.

Super Phenix was the ultimate demonstration breeder reactor and it failed miserably; 7 percent capacity factor over 14 years. That's it. We're shut down. Monju in Japan, which is the most recent fast reactor, had a fire, a sodium fire after 18 months. It was shut for 14 years.

So there has essentially been no learning curve in fast reactors since 1951 since EBR-1 was. It's been like this, so it's almost random whether the next reactor is going to work or not.

And so before you consider whether these reactors can do many of these things, I

believe that a fast reactor evaluation should first of all include a history. I'm going to submit the study that I did called plutonium end game in which many of these things are documented, including the fact that we have spent 100 billion dollars worldwide to date until 2 -- about the year 2000 trying to commercialize breeder reactors in the plutonium fuel cycle and failed both economically and technologically.

And there has to be some rational justification for throwing another few 100 billion dollars. And a few 100 billion dollars is not my estimate. Is was the estimate of Dr. Ralph Bennett that he presented to some legislatures in Boise the day before yesterday when he and I were presenting, so --

FACILITATOR BROWN: You're about at your limit there.

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: Okay. I will submit some comments, but I think the idea -- just to -- just a couple of closing remarks.

If you'll -- if you'll look here at the waste data, it's important to note that the volume of the waste is not going to be -- so first of all, your cycle is not going to be

closed.

Secondly, the volume of the waste is not going to be reduced by going to your fast reactor cycle, because you're generating greater than Class C waste. In one -- you have 71,000 cubic meters of spent fuel, and in fast reactor cycle, you have 50,000 cubic meters of high-level waste and you have 400,000 cubic meter of greater than Class C waste, which has to be disposed off in a repository.

You can do the math. It is more than six times greater the volume of waste that has to be disposed off in a repository. Yes, there are thermal considerations and there are others. But -- but I think this document while it presents some numbers pretty fairly has omitted an enormous number of environmental impacts.

I don't see the generation of liquid impacts and the impacts on rivers, waters, and ocean. I don't see the depleted uranium disposal. I don't see recovered uranium disposal. And I see almost no attention to the technical history of the fast reactor program.

The thorium program -- well --

FACILITATOR BROWN: One more --

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: I'm out of time, so --

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much.

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: Thank you.

TERRY TODD: Hi. My name is Terry Todd. I was raised in Montana, so not far from here. And I've lived in Idaho Falls area for about 25 years. Actually I lived in Pocatello for 15 years and I live near Aberdeen now for the past 10 years.

One of the reasons we moved out to Aberdeen, or in the country, was my wife has a bad case of asthma and living in Pocatello was very detrimental for her health. And I can look from my house over and see a blue haze over Pocatello almost every day from some of the industry in the area. And I can tell you that her health has greatly improved since moving out in the country. So clean air is something that my family is very sensitive to and it's very important to us.

I have a Ph.D in chemical engineering, and I work at the INL, but I'm not here representing the INL. I'm representing myself as

a private citizen.

And I support the research into all forms of energy that don't produce carbon dioxide; wind, solar, geothermal, and nuclear. But of all those energy sources, I believe nuclear is our best opportunity to really reduce carbon dioxide in our atmosphere, mainly because it's a base load technology. It produces a constant high capacity stream of energy as opposed to a very sporadic stream, which is difficult to manage and difficult to maintain.

So my main purpose tonight was to just go on record supporting the GNEP program and the closed fuel cycle. I strongly support research into new technology. And one of those motivations, as been brought up before, is because I have children and I'm interested in their future. I'm interested in having them grow up in a society that has a lot of opportunity, which includes clean air, which includes clean water, which includes ample energy to enjoy their life.

One -- one comment I didn't write down that I would like to add, there's a little over 6 billion people in the world and about

1.6 million of them do not have any access to energy at all. So as this quality of life and the standard of living for those people mostly in Africa and Asia increases, the demand for energy is going to increase exponentially in the next several decades.

And if we don't come up with real high level of energy solutions that could produce large amounts of energy with no impact to our environment, our alternatives are fossil fuels and coals. That's the only way we could meet the demand in that short a time frame. And like I say, I'm all for development of wind and solar, but they're never going to makeup that difference until decades and decades from now at best.

And so I really think our best hope for the future is to focus on nuclear energy and in particular the closed fuel cycle.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks, Terry. Jon Carmack is next and Jon will be followed by Jack Wallace.

JON CARMACK: I'm Jon Carmack and I've lived here in Idaho Falls for 14 years, and I didn't grow up here. I grew up kind of all over.

But I was thinking about why I -- why I've ended up here in Idaho Falls and it's really to work at the Idaho National Laboratory over the years.

Over the years I've worked in both solar, fusion, fission energy technologies and I was thinking about -- I was sitting here thinking why. Why did I go into energy technologies, and I think I'm going blame it on my dad. Because my dad grew up in rural Tennessee, and fairly poor, but they did very well over time because they -- they ended up going to school. All of the kids in the family ended up attending college and moving on and being scientists and engineers.

But I grew up with my dad telling me about growing up in rural Tennessee and how hard it was to work, and how they lived with no power. And they lived -- you know, I don't -- many of you didn't grow up in Tennessee, but it does snow in Tennessee, and it gets cold in Tennessee.

And we never had a fireplace in my house because my dad said that the coldest times in his life have been standing in front of a fireplace. And that's how he grew up; with no electricity; no power; and doing his homework by candlelight. And I didn't believe him.

And so when I was 16, my dad moved us to Egypt and I learned what it was like to be without power because once a month for about a week, the power would go off. And the first thing that we would do is we would run and start running all the water into any bucket that we had and any of our storage barrels for water because the water would end.

And then we would make sure that we had little propane bottles so that we could cook. And then we would learn what it was like to take -- not have a shower because the water was not running. And we took bath-towel showers. And this went on for a couple of days and maybe we'd be lucky and it would come on after a day or so, but you could never tell. And God forbid you were in an elevator when it happened because that was always a joy.

But I also learned what it was like to do my homework by candlelight. And if you've ever done your homework by candlelight, I think that's why I've -- why I wear corrective lenses today is once a month the power would go out and we'd live without -- without energy.

So I think -- my comments today, I've

worked in -- I presently work in development of fission energy for the future. I think the United States and -- has a dire need for sustainable, secure energy. And it needs to be a broad spectrum across all of the energy production methods.

Specifically in nuclear energy and fission energy, I'd like to address a couple of things. I think the Department of Energy needs to expand the use of commercial light water reactors in the United States today because that's the best practicing technology that we have available for the near term.

Following that I think the Department needs to further develop high temperature reactors for process heat and applications for hydrogen generation. And then the Department needs to do the research and development needed to fully close the nuclear fuel recycle because I look at my son, who's sitting over in the side, and I don't want him to do his homework by a candlelight, but ten years from now when China joins the energy consumption mix that is on par with the United States, he might get the -- get the -- he might get the chance to learn or his

children will.

I'd like to make a comment on the learning curve because I've been on -- in on the learning curve on fast reactors over the past few years. I didn't start in the beginnings of the fast reactor development program in the United States, but the fast reactor development program really began here in Idaho, and at Argonne, and Chicago. And together those two national laboratories really developed fast reactors for the world today.

We have that technology available to us today. It was demonstrated -- the closure of the fuel cycle was actually demonstrated in the integral fast reactor program in 1994 and prior. And so that -- that technology is available today.

FACILITATOR BROWN: If you could make just one more point.

JON CARMACK: Okay.

FACILITATOR BROWN: You're out of time. Thanks.

JON CARMACK: And I'll just wrap up that I think the United States just needs to move ahead and actually fund the research and

development needed to close the fuel recycle.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thanks. Our next speaker is Jack Wallace and Greg Crockett will be next. Again, I'll just ask people to pay attention to the one minute sign, if you would. I hate to interrupt. Please.

JACK WALLACE: Well, I guess I represent the long-toothed generation. Fifty-five years ago I arrived at the log cabin airport and wondering what had I gotten myself into and I was here as a group of people working on Chem Plant modifications to process navy fuels.

That was my introduction to reprocessing and I regretted seeing reprocessing ceasing, and I never quite understood the reasoning for it. I think -- I think, as I understand it, both the fast reactor programs and the reprocessing of fuels were discontinued to prevent nuclear proliferation, and if that was the purpose, then it's failed obviously. So I do support a return to reprocessing effort.

It -- now, I had a thought and it's gone. But I really do believe that those two

things have set us back substantially in the United States and put us as an also ran (phonetic) in the world. So I firmly support the reprocessing effort.

I have one other comment. I see multiple paths, and I think maybe -- maybe we need somebody like an Admiral Rickover that picked one path and drove all the way.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

GREG CROCKETT: Go for the go light.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Greg Crockett and Lane Allgood will be next.

GREG CROCKETT: Good evening. My name is Greg Crockett and I am currently the president of the Partnership for Science and Technology. My organization is a nonprofit grant grassroots organization formed to provide accurate and timely information on existing and proposed activities at the Idaho National Laboratory site and to advocate for nuclear energy, non-nuclear energy, and environmental technologies and decisions that are in the public interest.

Why? I'm a life-long resident of this city and are a supporter of nuclear energy and

the Draft PEIS. My comments tonight are on behalf of our membership of the PST.

As we are all aware, the world is becoming increasingly energy intensive, and if we are to be successful in meeting our future energy needs, nuclear power must play an even more significant role than it does currently.

The GNEP initiative is a way to successfully manage the nuclear fuel recycle and minimize waste issues while at the same time addressing national security. We believe reprocessing is key to revitalizing and growing the nuclear option.

One year ago in March, I joined with another 700-plus of my fellow Idaho citizens to demonstrate our support for the GNEP initiative that was originally outlined in the scoping documents. Since that time, it's become obvious that the original GNEP strategy was just too broad and the goal was too far reaching for many members of Congress to support at the present time.

While many of our peers are disappointed at this new and significantly narrower programmatic scope, our organization

feels this is an excellent opportunity for the Department of Energy to focus just on the programmatic analysis of closing the fuel cycle and the technologies to accomplish that end.

The Partnership for Science and Technology would like to go on record in support of moving from the current open fuel cycle strategy to a closed cycle, orient spent fuel is recycled for use in new fuel.

We understand that although the department's preference is to close the fuel cycle, a specific preferred alternative has yet to be selected. We realize that the decision to go forward with recycling does require additional research and development in fuel development and fabrication, fuel performance, and reactor technologies before wild-scale development can be accomplished.

This type of research and development work is what the Idaho National Laboratory has excelled in for the past 59 years. Our region has vigorously supported nuclear research at the INL from day one and we believe that eastern Idaho unequivocally provides the best location for future nuclear energy research.

In closing, PST believes that closing the nuclear fuel cycle provides an opportunity for the United States of America to reclaim a leadership role in the global nuclear industry. We will continue to ask our congressional delegation to support nuclear energy research and we are prepared to call on our -- on the new administration to do the same.

Thank you.

LANE ALLGOOD: Thank you. My name is Lane Allgood. I'm a lifelong resident of Idaho Falls. I am the executive director of the Partnership for Science and Technology. My comments tonight will be -- will be my own. Obviously President Crockett just delivered the -- our organization's comments.

But I do want to make one comment as the executive director of the Partnership for Science and Technology, and that is to welcome all of you out to this event tonight. Many -- most of you are east Idaho residents, but I do see a few folks that are not from our area. And we also want to welcome and thank you for coming out and participating in this process.

Even though sometimes our opinions do

not mirror each other, please understand that our organization appreciates your comments and you're always welcome in our community. Dr. Makhijani, we know you traveled great distance to be with us tonight. Again, you're welcome in our community any time, and your comments are appreciated by our organization.

With that, I will turn to my comments. As we've all heard, our country's demand for electricity will increase by at least 30 percent by the year 2030. It's obvious that it's going to take a very diverse energy portfolio if we are to even have a chance of meeting this requirement.

Nuclear power is really the only technology mature non-polluting generation technology that is both proven and already deployed on a large scale. Sustaining electricity production from the current operating fleet of nuclear power plants is critical to just maintaining our current level of production. A major expansion of nuclear power is needed if we are going to meet our future energy needs.

Recently President-elect Obama has indicated nuclear power could play a significant

role in our nation's energy mix if there is a successful way to safely manage spent fuel. Closing the fuel cycle and reprocessing used fuel would have the potential to reduce the volume of waste required -- requiring disposal by reducing the thermal output and/or radiotoxicity of the waste. It appears to me this is an excellent first step.

I realize there are many technical challenges that will need to be addressed before the U.S. maintains its leadership role in the global nuclear energy industry. But I'm reassured that there are many -- that there are many professionals highly trained and experienced nuclear professionals right here in eastern Idaho.

In closing, I'd like to go on record in supporting the closed fuel cycle alternative. Doing so will tap into a very vast resource for power for us.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Our court reporter requested that when we got to the 9:00 hour if she could have a five-minute break, so we're just about at 9:00 so why don't

take five minutes and we will return.

John Flinn will be next up speaking, and then Suketh Gandhi will follow John. So we'll reconvene just after 9:00.

(Recess.)

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Our next speaker is John Flinn and as I mentioned Suketh Gandhi will follow John.

JOHN FLINN: Yes. My name is John Flinn. I'm a member and representing the INL Retired Employees Association. And I have a Ph.D in engineering and science and I'm an affiliate faculty member at the University of Idaho.

What kind of amazed me after I received a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement was what basically we had been exposed to a year ago last March in terms of the information. It pleased me greatly to see that the proposal with the impact statement now put kind of the focus on electrical energy generated from nuclear power plants.

Before it was more of the recycle aspect of the reactor technology to basically remove or greatly reduce the impact from the transuranic elements. Now, since the focus is

more on the electricity, it now brings us to the concept of what cycle do you choose. And we know that the open cycle is the one that's being basically produced now by the commercial industry and nuclear energy.

And those of us that's been affiliated with the nuclear end of things, materials, and what have you, we recognize that -- as Steve Piet had pointed out, that the commercial providers of nuclear energy are leaving an awful lot of energy basically in the spent fuel that still could be used effectively to generate more electric power through the nuclear recycle program.

So this concept of expanding the program for nuclear recycling for those of us who had some experience in the '80s, '70s and '80s, we were at loss in the '70s and '80s in terms of why the government drifted away from the nuclear -- the nuclear spent fuel recycling program, and we know that the rest of the world has basically not followed our steps.

So I'm somewhat convinced that the global aspect, the GNEP part of this, the global is really we're going to have to if we get the nuclear energy back into the front plate of our

energy needs, the global comes from the aspect that we're going to have to ask our foreign partners how to do all this stuff because we basically taught them in the '60s, '70s, and '80s and now we've got to go back and draw upon their information to bring us somewhat up to date on the nuclear power aspect.

As a member of the retirees, I feel that I'm pretty much a spokesman and what we would like to bring forth here is that we know through our experience that what is basically being proposed now with this Environmental Impact Statement is that certainly on the laboratory, or even above the laboratory scale, the INL, eastern Idaho, has basically addressed almost all the issues that's been performed in -- that's described in the impact statement.

And with that, we're hoping that, indeed, that the focus will be now on really nuclear reactor research, in particular the recycle program, the fuel recycle program, and we feel with the expertise we still have now, and even some facilities, to continue with this it's a logical thing to look at the INL for this type of support.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Suketh Gandhi will be followed by Robb Childs.

SUKETH GANDHI: Good evening. My name is Suketh Gandhi. And I move to talk about problems that I see with the PEIS that you have -- not your personally, but the Department of Energy.

First of all, when you talk compared to fatalities from cancer, why not just give us how many people would get cancer. Those raw data would be available from UK and France from reprocessing plants. What about radiation exposed from a fast reactor is from Soviet Union. Why not just present those -- the raw data -- the information that is available from those countries, that would give us a much better idea as far as health and safety of people surrounding those area.

Second, there are many, many problems with them, but I'm just going to highlight a few of them. Another one are, you talk about that you want to enclose this fuel cycle. You don't want to get the radioactive materials get into the atmosphere, but some of you there have a careful examination on many of the content.

I do see a weird source of radioactive material would enter the drinking water system, period. And question -- my question is that why not just discuss what the radioactive material, manmade radioactive elements isotopes are going to enter the water system and what criteria do you use them to -- that permit that to happen? Although, you stand correct to say they're ready to do that, but if you look into details it does point that way.

The other thing is that you talk about you want to close the fuel cycle about -- you do not have any plans or what are the hazards involved in bringing uranium from the back end of the fuel cycle to the front end of the fuel cycle. I mean, there are many issues that needs to be addressed and I'm just pointing out a few of them to point them out and I'll be presenting more in a more written document that I will give it later.

This is what I have to say and I hope the Department of Energy makes an honest commitment to bring all these issues out in the forefront rather than at the back end.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you very much. Robb Childs. Robb will be followed by John Tanner.

ROBB CHILDS: Good evening. My name is Robb Childs, and I'm the president and CEO of the Greater Idaho Falls Chamber of Commerce and also the chairman of the Idaho Chamber Alliance which represents over 15,000 businesses here throughout Idaho and 27 chambers of commerce. My comments will be reflected here upon the Greater Idaho Falls Chamber of Commerce right here.

The Greater Idaho Falls Chamber of Commerce board of directors are volunteers and staff who represent over 900 businesses just in the Greater Idaho Falls region. We strongly voice our support for closing the nuclear fuel cycle.

We understand a plentiful, reliable supply of energy is the cornerstone of sustained economic growth and prosperity and are convinced that GNEP offers our best hope for a clean, safe, abundant, proliferation resistant, energy future for this country and for the world.

It is a critical moment for our nation as we are confronted with a future that faces a

deficit of energy capacity. We understand that a stable energy future cannot depend on one energy source alone. We are strong advocates for all sources of energy, including nuclear, non-nuclear, and environmental technologies that will give us base load capacity.

We believe that Idaho should play a significant role in this initi- -- in this -- excuse me -- in this initiative and believe our state has proven -- has had a -- sorry, folks -- must have a proven record in nuclear research and development.

The Idaho National Laboratory is one of Idaho's largest employers providing thousands of jobs and having an economic impact in the billions. We strongly believe that Idaho has the most qualified and well educated workforce in the nation for GNEP operations and research and development.

As the home for the Center for Advanced Energy Studies, a program through which government, private industry, and academia can produce a new generation of people to solve the energy problems facing the world.

As the birthplace for peaceful

applications of atomic energy and the premiere national laboratory for nuclear research and development, the Greater Idaho Falls Chamber of Commerce fully endorses closing the fuel cycle and will continue to ask our congressional delegation to support nuclear energy research.

Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks, Robb. John Tanner is next and Cindie Jensen will be after John.

JOHN TANNER: I'm John Tanner. I'm president of Coalition 21, a local nuclear advocacy group. I have a Ph.D in physical chemistry. I moved here about 30 years ago to work at the INL and then retired 12 years ago.

There are two reasons why we must expand our use of nuclear energy, greatly expand it. One reason is global warming. Nuclear is the only energy source that can produce a large amount, a really large amount of carbon dioxide-free energy in a steady state, non-intermittent.

We presently get 20 percent of our electricity from nuclear energy. We could obviously get 40 or 50 percent if we decide to do

that. We have the uranium. We have the technology and the experience, lots of operating experience.

The idea that the other so-called alternative energies are wind and solar power could satisfy our future energy needs or replace an appreciable amount of the coal we use for electricity is pure speculation. Trying to fight global warming without nuclear energy is fighting the battle with our hands behind our back, with one hand behind our back and just not likely to succeed.

The second reason is resource conservation. We know quite a bit about the world's geology, and, to the best of our knowledge, the amount of recoverable energy at any of our close to present prices is -- will not be even a generation.

The use of natural gas to generate electricity is foolish beyond words. There are two requirements for expanding nuclear energy. One is we must deal with the waste. And to quote a recent campaign slogan, yes, we we can. Some say, well, just leave the spent fuel at the power plants. It's safe there. Sure it's safe, but

what kind of long-term planning is that?

We have a place where we can put the concentrated high-level waste, Yucca Mountain. Numerous -- all kinds of studies have given no reason to believe that it would not be safe there.

The other thing that needs to be done is for a long-term dependence on nuclear energy is to -- as has been mentioned many times already here, extend our fiscal resources by recycling the fuel that comes out -- spent fuel that comes out of the reactor. Of the uranium that goes into the reactor, only five percent is consumed before the fuel is taken out of the reactor.

We have some experience with reprocessing already. We can go to the French if we want some more experience. And in any case, if we could only consider proven technologies, we'd still be back in the Stone Age.

The fears of the plutonium use -- separation of plutonium is a proliferation risk are really exaggerated and I guess I don't have time to go into that. It's safe to say no nation that uses plutonium for weapons would want to or ever has used commercially obtained plutonium.

It just is too low a grade and too unreliable.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much. Cindie Jensen and Andrea Shipley would be next.

CINDIE JENSEN: Good evening. I'm Cindie Jensen and I was born and raised in Rigby and have lived in the Rigby/Idaho Falls area most of my -- all of my life, which is a very long time. And I won't say how many years. I'm a mother of seven, and I'm a grandmother of 16. And the majority of them all live in the Idaho Falls area.

I've worked as an administrator at the INL for 32 years and support the nuclear energy research that has been developed at the laboratory. I believe that nuclear energy is clean, safe, and environmentally friendly, which is very important to me since we love the outdoors. We enjoy the lakes, rivers, mountains, and, of course, the golf courses.

I believe nuclear energy is an important energy source for my life and hopefully for my childrens' life, and I'm in support of the GNEP program.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Andrea Shipley. Wayne Price will be after Andrea.

ANDREA SHIPLEY: Good evening. My name is Andrea Shipley and I'm the executive director or the Snake River Alliance, Idaho's nuclear watchdog and advocate for renewable energy.

As many of you know, the Snake River Alliance has a long history of advocating for the cleanup of the radioactive legacy from the Cold War at the Idaho National Laboratory and protecting the Snake River Aquifer that lies underneath the contamination.

The Alliance understands the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership as essentially a global reprocessing program whereby supplier countries would provide nuclear reactors and fuel to user nations some of which might not be able to safeguard such dangerous plants and then take the radiated fuel back to extract plutonium from it to use in nuclear reactors that won't be built for decades, if at all.

GNEP would generate vast amounts of nuclear waste and pollution. Cost a bailout size portion of the $700 billion and make it possible

for plutonium to get into the hands of potential enemies thus reversing decades of nonproliferation work.

GNEP is not recycling. In our opinion, recycling is a benefit to the environment if it conserves resources and reduces waste. Reprocessing does the opposite. It uses and contaminates immense quantities of water; creates more nuclear waste, and is the single largest nuclear air pollution source.

Reprocessing commercial fuel would also create substantial quantities of liquid high-level nuclear waste that we have so far been ill equipped to deal with safely. And without a proven and responsible solution to nuclear waste already in place, the Alliance remains skeptical.

A half century of Cold War reprocessing for the country's nuclear weapon's program created some of the most contaminated sites in the U.S. and, indeed, in the western hemisphere at Hanford, Savannah River, and here at home in Idaho.

To now suggest reprocessing as a part of an energy generation scheme ignores the truth that solar and wind have a much faster, cheaper,

and safer payoff. The Alliance believes we must look at sustainable, renewable, affordable sources of energy including wind, solar, geothermal, biomass energy efficiency, and conservation.

These energy sources in a mix do not involve something as dangerous and economically unfeasible as GNEP. The Alliance requests that the 60-day comment period be extended to 120 days and a more economical and sensible solution to nuclear waste than reprocessing and global distribution of proliferation materials.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Wayne Price. Beatrice Brailsford will follow Wayne.

WAYNE PRICE: Well, I'm -- I wish I did have a prepared speech because I'm not a very good public speaker. But I moved to Idaho in '97 and since then have created three businesses, and Idaho has been very good to me. I love Idaho.

And I've got a few things to say on our -- this nuclear issue. First of all, I am definitely very pro-nuclear. As a businessman, we know how to budget; we meet a payroll and have done for 12 years. And it's out of this -- the

small businesses and big businesses -- if we didn't have this in our country, we wouldn't have a laboratory or a lot of other things. And I hope you appreciate the -- you know, it's the small businesses that pay the money so this country can continue to run.

Now, having said that about the numbers, I look at the numbers of things like windmills, and solar cells, and nuclear power, and the numbers work for nuclear power. They don't work for windmills, and government subsidizes them. And nuclear power is -- in my opinion is a fabulous thing. I'm an American and the thing that drives America as I mentioned is jobs and businesses.

Now, nuclear power, or I should say power in general, is what drives our whole economy. Now bear with me for just a second. If someone with the resources is to come to Idaho and say, I'm going to build a power plant. We have the technology -- oh, look at that. (Wayne Price's cell phone rang.) I turned that off once and then turned it on the -- in the -- when I went out. Excuse me.

Bear with me. If we -- if we went and

had the resources to build a power plant and lead not only Idaho but the world with a power plant here and offered electricity at one/tenth the going rate, Idaho's economic problems would be over with. And everybody in the nation would be moving to Idaho. Because it's energy that fuels manufacturing. We'd have our manufacturing back. We'd get our mining back. We'd get our smelters back. We'd get our steel mills back.

All these things could come back with cheap power. Nuclear has the ability to do that. Can you imagine Idaho being that light on a hill that brings -- that brings the whole world's attention to Idaho? Because why? Because we offer to the public and to the -- and to our businesses cheap power. The same thing can be done with oil. Oil works on the numbers. The drawbacks are few.

I just appreciate the opportunity to come up and share a few ideas, and a few concerns. And in parting, I guess I have one minute, I am not in favor of the global idea because I think the global idea tends to make it so that good old USA ends up bringing waste from Europe and shipping it to America.

And we've done some dumb things before. And I can see this one coming. We hadn't ought to be doing things like that. So I get pretty nervous when I talk about -- or when I hear about all these global alliances for fear of what it can -- it can tie us down to.

Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks, Wayne. Beatrice Brailsford and Darrell Siemer will be next.

BEATRICE BRAILSFORD: My name is Beatrice Brailsford. I'm with the Snake River Alliance, an Idaho-based grassroots group working for peace and justice, the end to nuclear weapons, responsible solutions to nuclear waste and contamination, and sustainable alternatives to nuclear power.

The gentleman who proceeded me raised some -- spoke about the notion that this is a Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. That is certainly one of the concerns that we see. Congress has tried to slow the Department of Energy's push to sell this program to other countries and the Department of Energy has resisted that.

And I would like to encourage the Department of Energy to at least acknowledge a Congressional role in that decision. We're not talking about bringing nuclear waste back from Europe. We're talking about Jordan, Ghana, countries that may well not be able to handle this program and certainly bringing the waste back here.

And remember Ray said right in the introduction that the Department of Energy could amass spent fuel at a site that might later reprocess it, and I would say that that is called long-term interim storage and Idahoans have objected to that before.

The whole basis for GNEP, I can't tell from the PEIS, I can't tell from the public statements, is GNEP a research and development program? Because thus far it has demanded and received hundreds of millions of dollars in support of research and development, or is it a scheme that we will have a closed fuel cycle and this whole giant nuclear enterprise?

Both of those confuse me because if it's a proven technology, why does the commercial industry go to Congress and ask for loan

guarantees and why does DOE go to Congress and ask -- not Congress, us, and ask for hundreds of millions of dollars of research money?

So decide that as you're describing this program and then please tell us who is we, when we close the nuclear fuel cycle. As far as I'm aware, electricity is produced in this country by in large not by government, but by private enterprise.

And I think that citizens of the United States have long supported that as the way we want to have our power done. If the government in the guise of this program is now suggesting that -- that the government, you know -- private industry that has been turning the lights on all these years has always been able to close the fuel cycle if that's what private industry wants to do.

If DOE is somehow going to corral the nuclear industry into doing it a different way, that's something different than the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. It's a fundamental change in the way this country produces and consumes electricity.

I too have supported the notion that we

need more time to look at this PEIS. It is not one of the DOE's better efforts, but I would say that particularly because the second goal of the purpose and need for agency action is to reduce nuclear proliferation risks. Now, we all know that reprocessing is the "must take" step between a nuclear reactor and a nuclear bomb.

So by definition, the closed fuel cycle does present proliferation risks. But, furthermore, if that is one of the three primary purposes of this action, the Department of Energy must release a non-proliferation assessment and that -- the release of that document as far as I'm concerned is when the public can actually assess this Programmatic EIS and make comments upon it.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Darryl Siemer and Leilani Beard is the next.

DARRYL SIEMER: My name is Darryl Siemer. I'm a Ph.D chemist. I've worked at the site 28 years.

I'm here to make a case for one of the original gen four options. It was the only one that was dropped. There were six ways of

implementing nuclear power for the future. It was DOE's primary mission until just a couple of years ago and then it got basically shot down.

And GNEP replaced it. Congress has not treated GNEP very well. The National Academy of Science hasn't treated it very well. So we end up with this document. But it really does boil down to, I think the site's mission and I think, you know, as a pro-nuke -- I'm very pro-nuke, my issue with this program that we have here is it doesn't really address the issues that people like Mr. Obama have with nuclear power.

There's intrinsic proliferation issues with reprocessing. And recycling of existing the type of fuel that is used in today's generation of reactors is intrinsically proliferation sensitive because you do separate uranium and you do separate plutonium. And it's extremely costly.

And people have resisted this. We have built reprocessing facilities; some of which never operated; some operated a little bit; and a few were dragged along for 30 years like out at the site with various missions, some of which were accomplished, some of which weren't. But

they didn't work out very well.

This problem with the way we've implemented nuclear power was pointed out, anticipated a long time ago by the director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Alvin Weinberg. He was an original pioneer of the world's nuclear industry. He helped develop the reactors that are put in Hanford to make the plutonium, which ended World War II. He patented the pressurized or the light water reactor, which the world now uses to generate power.

But he anticipated the problems during the '60s of implementing civilian nuclear power in the -- to the degree that it would have to be to address the energy issues that way with uranium fuel cycle.

The uranium fuel cycle generates plutonium. The only one that doesn't is the one that uses 100 percent enriched uranium. All others do including all power reactors generate it. They use -- they all use solid fuel elements, which are difficult to fabricate. You only can burn something like 5 percent of the potentially fissile material in a solid fuel element before it has to be taken out of the

reactor and either thrown away, temporarily stored -- temporary means whatever it means -- or it can be recycled using reprocessing.

Reprocessing has been resisted. It has cost a lot of money and has accomplished very much -- very little in the world. In order to implement these options here, we have to go to something cleaner, something better, something that doesn't generate plutonium. Something that doesn't require a 2000 PSI container around the reactor in order to keep it from blowing up.

And that was Weinberg's baby and it was called the Molten Salt Reactor. And it was really invented by his boss, Eugene Wigner a long time ago. These reactors run with thorium. Thorium goes into them. Fissile is created in the reactor and is burned in the reactor. There is no transuranic -- or essentially no transuranic waste generated with these things. Consequently there is no long-term waste disposal issue with these.

The fuel is 100 percent consumed within the reactor. It does not have to be taken out after 5 percent of it's gone, stored, transported, or reprocessed somewhere else. So

it doesn't continue -- the problems that we've been living with with nuclear power for as long as we've had nuclear power.

It's time to start over again and do it right. Oak Ridge National Laboratory studied this extensively for about 15 years, and Mr. -- Dr. Weinberg lasted one year longer in the military industrial complex than I did. I lasted 28 years. He lasted 29 before he was fired for being a contrarium --

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. If you could just make one final point.

DARRYL SIEMER: Yeah. Well, Mr. Weinberg, Dr. Weinberg, characterized today's approach to nuclear power with the plutonium uranium fuel cycle. You can't avoid plutonium if you go with uranium as a Faustian bargain. It's time to change it. DOE had a chance to change it. It included MSRs as one of the options and it dropped it. It dropped it because --

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay.

DARRYL SIEMER: -- because vendors can't make money if they don't deal with plutonium and they don't make solid fuel elements.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Leilani Beard and Linda Martin will follow Leilani.

LEILANI BEARD: And my name is actually Leilani Beard.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Oh, Leilani. Sorry.

LEILANI BEARD: I'm not a nuclear scientist, so I want to make that very clear. I'm actually an environmental scientist and I'm a senior at the University of Idaho. And a year ago, I have to say, that I was an anti-nuclear person.

At that time, I was supporting biofuels until I quickly realized that crops used for fuel will be used for -- will use up our land, our precious water, and our -- the fuel that we need for ourselves and or own food. We cannot starve but we will -- but we will -- sorry. I wasn't planning on speaking tonight. But we will if farmers are paid more to grow what is popular, and at this point it's biofuels.

I met a nuclear scientist a year ago and she was from France. And she helped me understand the nuclear process and become

educated. The learning curving was steep.

I have actually -- during that time, I've spoken with people in Paris. I took the initiative upon myself to educate myself, and actually go to the source and get feedback from them. In France, they have been using nuclear fuel at -- for 30 years. And the people that I've talked to have not noticed any difference. In fact, their lifestyles have been improved greatly and they have not suffered any ill side effects or health effects from that. And there have been no issues of proliferation during that 30-year period.

France is a perfect role model for us to follow in nuclear power production providing more than 80 percent of their nation's energy needs. Of all the prolifer -- prolifer -- excuse me. I am in support of a closed fuel cycle program, preferably with fast breeder reactor which does not use our valuable water.

As a solution, nuclear waste must be recycled. Reducing the amount of nuclear waste that adversely affects our environment by making the entire amount generated over a 70-year period down to the size of a dinner plate; not a

mountain in Nevada, a dinner plate. It is astounding, isn't it? But it can be done.

All of the waste at INL was buried instead of recycled. We are eating the banana peel instead of the banana and it has given me a bitter taste. Recycling spent fuel is the only alternative and combined with nuclear energy it will catapult us into the future ahead of the other countries that have been actively using nuclear fuel as a source of power while America has been stagnant due to the many policy changes, fear of the unknown, and lack of education; lack of knowledge that has left us behind.

We need to educate ourselves just as I have this last year. If we are going to continue using i-Pods for music, computers for schools for educating ourselves, spending time on the Internet, and warming our homes in the winter and cooling them in the summer, we need to make a change and a drastic change or we will be left in the dark, a cold, dark place.

As an environmental student, the environment is important to me and should be considered at the top of the list for any business. Coal is not an option. If you want a

reason why look at the quality of air in China that the athletes were affected by during the Olympics this summer.

Nuclear energy is a clean, green, safe and sustainable form of power and a choice we need to get behind as a nation to protect our own economy and reduce our dependence on foreign oil minimizing the effects we have all felt this last year at the fuel pumps. Nuclear energy can and will power our hydrogen and electric cars, instead of solar and wind, they cannot.

I want GNEP to move forward because it recycles fuel, extending our supply of uranium which is finite. It is stupid to put it in the mountains when it can be fit on the size of a dinner plate.

I am sad that we have been dragging our feet. The DOE needs to make up its mind now and, yes, it is possible to do what we have done in the last 30 years in five to seven years; not the next 40. We have an opportunity today to -- as those who care about the environment and want to make ourselves independent from foreign oil, we can tear down the dams that are killing our fish, stop the coal plants that are polluting our

power -- our water and our air, and convert our power -- our gasoline-powered cars to electric, that will create a green, clean world free -- with free flowing water and noise-free cities.

As an environmental science student, a mother of two daughters, and a citizen of this country, I support GNEP.

And, finally, three points very quickly that I want to leave with you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Yeah, you're over time.

LEILANI BEARD: I'm sorry.

FACILITATOR BROWN: So if you could make it --

LEILANI BEARD: Just really quick.

FACILITATOR BROWN: -- really quick. Okay.

LEILANI BEARD: Those of you supporting solar power, educate yourselves because solar power cells are made with nuclear isotopes.

Number 2, China will be building one nuclear power plant every year for the next 30 years. And we have not done anything in the last 25 years. We are way behind. And, thirdly, nuclear is used for medicine helping to save many

lives. Let petroleum be used for plastics and cosmetics.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Linda Martin and Holly Murdock Ashley can be next.

LINDA MARTIN: I have two statements of -- one which I'll read and one is from my husband. We flipped. Somebody had to stay home and baby-sit, so I'm going to read a statement that is from Lee Radford, President of Grow Idaho Falls. And my name is Linda Martin and I am the executive director of Grow Idaho Falls. We are a non-profit, public, private, economic development partnership for Bonneville County, Idaho, the City of Idaho Falls, and the City of Ammon.

Our membership includes private companies which invest in the diversification of the economy of Bonneville County. And we do this by advocating for primary jobs and to increase the tax base within our communities. And much of that effort includes building upon the research, development, demonstration, and deployment capabilities of the Idaho National Lab.

As our world faces a deficit of energy

capacity, our investors know that the continued advocacy for nuclear energy, non-nuclear energy, and environmental technologies and strategies are vital not only to our country's public interest, but our own in Idaho.

By closing the nuclear fuel cycle, two longstanding problems could be solved. One, it increases the sustainability of nuclear energy through more efficient waste management practices and strategies.

And number two, it would reduce the risk of proliferation by reprocessing the used fuel, recycling it, and thereby reducing the volume of the waste requiring geologic disposal as well as reducing the thermal output and/or radiotoxicity of the waste itself. I'm sorry. I'm getting hoarse.

Therefore, we feel reprocessing is necessary to revitalize and expand the use of nuclear energy to meet rising energy demands. Therefore, let there be no mistake, we support the strategy to move to the closed fuel cycle for spent nuclear fuel. We believe this is the required strategy to be competitive with other countries in the world that follow in the same

strategy.

The INL is the designated lead lab for nuclear energy research, and we believe that INL has a proven track record in the scientific aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle and being able to close the recycle is the next logical step. A year ago last March over 700 Idahoans met to show their regional support for the GNEP initiative that was originally outlined in the scoping documents. And while GNEP has a vision and has experienced challenges which may affect its future, or narrow its original scope, its basic mission should not altered.

Now may be the perfect time and opportunity for DOE to focus on the analysis of closing the fuel cycle and enlist, expand, and support the capabilities of the INL to develop the technologies to accomplish that task. And we, as Grow Idaho Falls, and the community are prepared to welcome the commercial nuclear sector to look at Idaho Falls, Idaho as a future partner in their success.

We hope to leverage our workforce, our skills, our advocacy, our quality of life, and the assets of the INL to further the use of

nuclear energy and related technologies. We will continue to ask our Congressional delegation to support nuclear energy research and initiatives, and we are prepared to request of the new administration to review the accomplishments, history, and support our region has offered for this effort.

Thank you. As the mayor said, we do have available land.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much. Okay. Our next speaker is Holly Murdock Ashley and she will be followed by Cindy Smith-Putnam.

HOLLY MURDOCK ASHLEY: Hi. One of the reasons my full name was printed out there is because I'm here representing a family who's lived in eastern Idaho for over five generations growing Idaho potatoes called Murdock Farms. And my brothers were here for the first meeting and were able to speak to you themselves, and they couldn't make it tonight, so I'm here as their representative.

And the things we'd like to comment to you on is that we appreciate the opportunity to review the document and to provide comments on it and appreciate the difficulty in trying to write

such a very -- a document about a very technical and controversial topic.

And we feel like you did a good job because they can even understand most of what you said in it. So that was really good. I do also work out at the INL, so some of you here know me from out there.

The first thing I'd like to say, though, is in section 276, which is about your alternatives considered eliminated under that section, you spoke a little bit in there about the non-nuclear electricity production section and we appreciate the part that you're saying that you're not going to -- you're not trying to say this is an either/or, we're not doing that, and feel like you need to make sure it stays within the document and maybe even expand on that a little bit more.

Part of their concern is is that if this isn't addressed in this document that then it continues to be a question in the people -- in the public's mind about whether or not it's a viable alternative for our nuclear energy for our energy resources.

Then in section 4.8, the unavoidable

adverse impacts, they also appreciate the part there that you actually put it in pretty good language there about what would be the unavoidable impacts, but also would like to say that, you know, in any alternative we're talking about about energy that you've heard about before, that there's impacts no matter what it is. Whether it's wind; whether it's any of the other types of alternatives, and so that was also one of the sections that they really appreciated being in the document.

Okay. And the other section was in the areas of controversy, and they also felt that that was a very important document to them as they were reading through this, that it helped spell out what you are recognizing are still very much areas of controversy. And so -- and felt that that was fairly accurate. That that's where they -- they also felt like you were addressing a good thing there.

And in the -- in closing, I would like to suggest that one the other issues you might want to include about issues to be resolved is the -- in that section it seems like any time we have these public documents and we open them up

to the public, while we all appreciate the opportunity to provide you comments, tell you what we liked about it, where we have concerns, where we don't feel like you've addressed it, what we see happens in the regulatory process is that because we get to make comments, is the public has stalled all of the efforts, it takes forever to go forward, and like my dad who's 86 says, haven't you started to build it yet?

Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Cindy Smith-Putnam.

CINDY SMITH-PUTNAM: My name is Cindy Smith-Putnam and like Terry Todd, I originally held for Montana. We are in year 16 of our five-year plan for Idaho and Idaho Falls, which tells you how well we've liked it here.

But we moved here for reasons that had nothing to do with nuclear energy or the site. In fact, we were really ignorant to the fact that those things were even here. And, furthermore, we moved here from Missoula, Montana, which anybody who's familiar with Montana knows it's sort of like the Boulder, Colorado. We're the San Francisco of Montana. And I attended the

University of Montana, which is also sort of the anomaly of the state. And so I'm a product of all of that, both by education and upbringing.

And my husband loves me anyway, even though he likes to say like that I'm a long-haired, teary-eyed, tree-hugging, bedwetting, granola-munching liberal. Most of that I claim with pride except for maybe the bedwetting, teary-eyed part. And in particular, I do love mother earth. I want to reduce our footprint on her.

As you know, Montana has no nuclear industry to speak of, and so early on when we came here, our Realtor spoke to us of the site as if we should know what she was talking about and we didn't want to seem dense, so it took us a while to ask about the site.

And using my active imagination, I concocted sort of mysterious, intriguing fantasies about what the site might be; maybe the archaeological place where the Lost Atlantis people had come from, or Roswell Lake, or something like that.

So imagine how aghast I was when I found out that actually it meant nuclear

research. Because lacking any real frame of reference, for me nuclear was the other N word, and my emotional visceral reaction to the word nuclear was almost like worst than saying the IRS.

I did fear what I didn't understand. But I don't anymore. And I would love to tell you that like Maureen Finnerty, my education and conversion occurred because of laborious, scholarly, you know, intellectual, academic study and research, but the truth is that I found nuclear religion around a great, many, big-ass campfires where scandalous amounts of cheap light beer were consumed.

And the way that that happened is that the new friends that we made when we moved to Idaho all turned out to be nuclear engineers holding Ph.D.s. Highly intellectual, well-educated, intelligent people whose opinions I respected. And any one who camps knows that a campfire -- a talk around a campfire is unhurried and you solve the great problems of the world there. And it's philosophical and you have give and take and there's lots of time.

And so for every strident, fear-based

objection that I could come up with, my friends around campfire countered me with calm, measured, undefensive scientific facts. They were patient and persistent and I think you guys culture that patience and persistence, you have to be to work in the environment they work in where everything works -- moves so slowly.

They never changed my values. I still love mother earth, but because I do, they changed my beliefs. So much so that I pushed myself to learn more and became a lay student of nuclear, both in its potential and its impact and eventually became one of the founding members of Partnership for Science and Technology.

You'll be gratified to know that we don't drink any beer in those meetings, and interested to know that many of the people who serve on that board have no connection to the site like me. I work at the hospital.

And so it's really a broad base grassroots organization. But my new belief comes from a place of science based information rather that ideologically based fears, and although I agree with many of the people that have spoken tonight against the PEIS and that were sort of

anti-GNEP in general that our energy portfolio should include renewables.

I also realize that all of those combined are not nearly enough to meet our energy demands. Closing the fuel cycle with environmentally responsible reprocessing helps to address the final lingering concern that I had with nuclear energy and that was how to lesson and reduce the impacts of spent fuels.

For that reason and many others that have already been expressed here tonight, I support the concept of recycling in general. I urge my government to move swiftly to close that cycle with all due diligence.

I look forward to the final PEIS, and I suggest that there is no better place to locate all the work that will be required to advance this initiative than right here in southeast Idaho.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much.

That concludes the folks who requested to speak and we're also approaching the hour that we customarily adjourn these meetings at, so it's a happy coincidence. I want to thank everybody

for attending, for your attention, your comments, and we are officially adjourned. Thanks very much.

(The hearing concluded at 9:56 p.m.)

-ooOoo-

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF IDAHO)
COUNTY OF BONNEVILLE) ss.
)

I, Lanice M. Lewis, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho, do hereby certify:

That within entitled hearing was taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place therein named and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction, and that the foregoing transcript contains a full, true and verbatim record of said hearing.

I further certify that I have no interest in the event of the action.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 2nd day of December 2008.

Lanice M. Lewis
Notary Public in and for
the State of Idaho.

My Commission Expires: 11/10/12